

FORMER MARINE CORPS AIR STATION

~~CERTIFIED~~

EL TORO

PUBLIC MEETING

MARCH 29, 2006

6:30 P.M.

PROPOSED PLAN

FOR

INSTALLATION RESTORATION SITES 8 AND 12

IRVINE CITY HALL

IRVINE, CALIFORNIA

ORIGINAL

REPORTED BY: MACHELLE JAARSMAN, CSR NO. 9800



910 W. SAN MARCOS BOULEVARD, SUITE 202
SAN MARCOS, CALIFORNIA 92078
PHONE 760.744.0705 FAX 760.744.0484

PUBLIC MEETING

MARCH 29, 2006

MR. DARREN NEWTON: We are on the record.

Thank you for attending this public meeting for Installation Restoration Sites 8 and 12 Proposed Plan. My name is Darren Newton. I'm the BRAC Environmental Coordinator for Former MCAS El Toro. Regulatory Agency representatives are here this evening.

The agenda for this meeting is as follows: I'll provide an overview of the Navy's IR program. After the IR overview, Mr. Jim Callian, the Navy RPM, will present a summary of the Proposed Plan for Sites 8 and 12. The Regulatory Agencies concur with this Proposed Plan for excavation and disposal of soil from the impacted units that will be discussed in the Proposed Plan summary.

After the presentation of the Proposed Plan, the Navy will answer clarifying questions on the materials presented; for example, clarification of any of the terms presented in the Proposed Plan summary.

Please hold your questions or comments for the formal comment portion of this meeting. The Navy will not address your comments or questions now, but they will be addressed in a responsive summary and

1 documented in the Record of Decision.

2 Tonight we're focused on Sites 8 and 12.
3 Site 8 is a former Defense Reutilization and Marketing
4 Office, and Site 12 is the Sludge Drying Beds.
5 However, it's important to generally describe the
6 Installation Restoration Program so that you may
7 better understand the current phase of Sites 8 and 12
8 in the overall process.

9 For the BRAC Program Management Office West,
10 I am the appointed BRAC Environmental Coordinator for
11 El Toro. I have the responsibility and authority to
12 conduct Installation Restoration Programs. I'm also
13 the Navy's representative on the BRAC Cleanup Team,
14 which is a team composed of the Navy and Regulatory
15 Agencies working collaboratively towards completing
16 the IR Program and satisfying the necessary regulatory
17 requirements.

18 The IR Program for Former El Toro is managed
19 by the BRAC Program Office West with support from the
20 Southwest Division Naval Facilities Engineering
21 Command. The BRAC PMO West reports to Deputy
22 Assistant Secretary of Navy for Installations and
23 Environment.

24 The purpose of the Navy's IR program is to
25 identify, investigate, assess, characterize, and clean

up hazardous substances; to reduce the risk of human health and the environment from past waste disposal operations and hazardous material spills. It is also to be consistent with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, which is CERCLA. It is sometimes known as the Superfund in the commercial sector. Another purpose of the Navy Installation Restoration Program is to reach the goal of moving all sites to site closure.

The CERCLA process and the Installation Restoration Program are summarized in this diagram. The first part of the CERCLA process is a Preliminary Assessment/Site Inspection phase. It's the PA/SI. It is generally a site discovery phase. It involves interviews, records research, and initial media sampling. The second step of the CERCLA process would be the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study, RI/FS, which includes detailed investigation and characterization of a site, as well as an analysis of alternatives for cleanup.

Following the Feasibility Study, we resolve to a Proposed Plan, and that's where we are now. The Proposed Plan is the presentation of the proposed alternative to the public and public comment period.

Following the Proposed Plan, the Navy

1 selects a Record of Decision, and these documents
2 select an alternative. Prior to selecting the
3 alternative, the Navy considers comments from the
4 public. The Record of Decision includes a
5 responsiveness summary, which addresses comments from
6 the public comment period.

7 After the Record of Decision, the Navy will
8 conduct a remedial design, which designs that remedy,
9 and will institute a response action. Following that,
10 the execution of that response action, the site will
11 be closed.

12 Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro,
13 Installation Restoration Program at a glance there are
14 there 24 sites listed in the IR Program. Former
15 El Toro is listed on the National Priorities List, and
16 the EPA is the lead regulatory agency.

17 The BRAC Cleanup Team is composed of the US
18 EPA, the Navy, California Department of Toxic
19 Substances Control and the Santa Ana Regional Water
20 Quality Control Board. A Federal Facilities Agreement
21 exists between the Navy and BCT members. Appendix A
22 of the Federal Facilities Agreement is a schedule of
23 submittal milestones for all MCAS El Toro IR sites,
24 and that's updated annually.

25 The BCT meets at least monthly -- bimonthly,

1 and members of the BCT are present this evening. The
2 FFA and the BCT are two mechanisms which streamline
3 the cleanup process by ensuring timely and thorough
4 coordination among the parties. And Appendix A is a
5 roadmap detailing the schedules and milestones.

6 Current phase for the Installation
7 Restoration Sites 8 and 12 is the Proposed Plan. The
8 Proposed Plan provides for community involvement,
9 summarizes environmental efforts to date, proposes a
10 remedial action, and leads to a Record of Decision.

11 The comment period for Sites 8 and 12 is
12 March 24th through April 26th. My address is clearly
13 shown on the Proposed Plan. It's on the reverse page
14 of the Proposed Plan, and it's on page 15 of the
15 Proposed Plan. After the Record of Decision, the Navy
16 will prepare a remedial design and conduct the
17 remedial action or cleanup work.

18 Mr. Jim Callian will now present a summary
19 of the Proposed Plan for Sites 8 and 12. Please hold
20 your questions or comments for the formal comment
21 period of the meeting. The Navy will not address your
22 comment or questions now, but they will be addressed
23 in a responsiveness summary and documented in the
24 Record of Decision.

25 MR. JIM CALLIAN: Good evening and welcome.

1 My name is Jim Callian. I am the Navy Remedial
2 Project Manager for the BRAC Program Management Office
3 West for this project.

4 Tonight I'm presenting a summary of the
5 Navy's Proposed Plan for remediating IR Sites 8 and
6 12.

7 Next please. The Navy is proposing
8 excavation and off-site disposal of contaminated soil
9 for selected areas at IR Site 8, the former Defense
10 Reutilization and Marketing Office, also known as the
11 DRMO storage yard; and IR 12, the former Sludge Drying
12 Beds. The selected areas for excavation, as I will
13 explain further in the next few slides, are within
14 Units 3 and 4 at IR Site 8 and within Unit 3 at IR
15 Site 12. Next please.

16 This is the site location map showing the
17 relative locations of Sites 8 and 12 in relation to
18 the former station boundaries. You can find this map
19 on page 2 of your Proposed Plan. You can see that
20 Sites 8 and 12 are located on the southwestern
21 boundary of the former station at these locations.
22 Sites 8 and 12. Next please.

23 This slide presents a description of IR Site
24 8. IR Site 8 was a DRMO storage yard for
25 containerized liquids, scrap, and salvage materials

1 including electrical transformers. Site 8 consists of
2 five units, which I will discuss in a moment. They
3 include: Unit 1, the east storage yard; Unit 2, the
4 west storage yard; Unit 3, the refuse pile area
5 located within the west storage yard; Unit 4, PCB
6 spill area located within the east storage yard; and
7 Unit 5, the old salvage yard. Next please.

8 This is a map of Site 8, which you can find
9 on page 11 of your Proposed Plan. Unit 1 is the east
10 storage yard. Unit 2 is the west storage yard. Unit
11 3 is the former refuse pile area. Unit 4 is the PCB
12 spill area, and Unit 5 is the old salvage yard. The
13 solid pattern on this map identifies the areas
14 proposed for excavation off-site disposal,
15 specifically Units 1, 3 and 4 in Site 8. And these
16 are located here, the solid areas. Next please.

17 This slide presents a description of IR Site
18 12, the former sludge drying beds, which consists of
19 four units including: Unit 1, the former west sludge
20 drying beds; Unit 2, the former east sludge drying
21 beds; Unit 3, the drainage ditch; and Unit 4, the
22 former wastewater treatment plant. Next please.

23 This next slide presents the location of the
24 four units within Site 12. You can also find this map
25 on page 11 of your Proposed Plan. Unit 1 is the west

1 sludge drying beds located on the western portion;
2 Unit 2, the east sludge drying beds; Unit 3, the
3 drainage ditch; and Unit 4, the former wastewater
4 treatment plan.

5 As in the previous figure, the area proposed
6 for soil excavation is noted with a solid pattern;
7 Unit 3, the drainage ditch. Next please.

8 At this time I'd like to run through a
9 summary of previous investigations conducted at IR
10 Sites 8 and 12. The Navy completed a Phase One
11 Remedial Investigation in May 1993 and a Phase Two
12 Remedial Investigation in June 1997. Following those
13 investigations, the Navy completed a Phase Two
14 Feasibility Study in January 1998.

15 And in May 1999, the Navy produced a
16 Proposed Plan for excavation and recycling of
17 excavating the soil and reuse of cover material for
18 other landfills on the station. In June 1999, the
19 Navy presented a draft ROD for Sites 8, 11, and 12
20 which selected excavation with recycling of excavated
21 soil as cover material for on-station landfills.
22 However, the final ROD was not issued and remedial
23 action was not started pending completion of a
24 radiological assessment. Next please.

25 The Navy subsequently completed an

1 Historical Radiological Assessment in May 2000 and
2 reevaluated the risks in a technical memorandum
3 produced in February 2003. The Navy completed a
4 Radiological Release Report for Sites 8, 12 and 25 in
5 November 2004 and completed a Feasibility Study
6 Addendum for Site 8 in February 2006, which evaluated
7 remedial alternatives for radiological constituents at
8 Site 8.

9 Finally, we're presenting this revised
10 Proposal Plan for Sites 8 and 12 to the public
11 tonight. Next please.

12 At this time I'd like to encourage you to go
13 to these locations: the Heritage Park Regional Library
14 or the MCAS El Toro Administrative Record File at the
15 BRAC office to review previous investigation reports
16 or to obtain additional information regarding these
17 sites. These locations are listed on page 15 of your
18 Proposed Plan. Next please.

19 This slide starts with the previous
20 investigation results. As a part of the CERCLA
21 process, the Navy used previous investigation results
22 to evaluate risks and to propose remedial action where
23 necessary to protect human health and the environment.

24 At Site 8 volatile organic compounds, VOCs;
25 semi-volatile organic compounds or SVOCs; polynuclear

1 aromatic hydrocarbons, PAHs; polychlorinated
2 biphenyl's, PCBs; pesticides; petroleum hydrocarbons;
3 and naturally occurring metals were identified in soil
4 most frequently at depths from zero to four feet below
5 ground surface.

6 Radium concentrations in shallow surficial
7 soils at several locations within Units 1 and 4
8 exceeded the naturally occurring background
9 concentration. Radium 226 concentrations in remaining
10 units were consistent with the naturally occurring
11 background concentrations.

12 Soil contamination was localized and did not
13 extend to or pose a threat to groundwater, which
14 occurs at approximately 100 feet below ground surface
15 at this site. Next please.

16 Based on the previous investigation results
17 and on a risk evaluation conducted by the Navy, the
18 following were recommended actions for Site 8. I'd
19 like to note that a summary of the risk evaluation and
20 recommended actions are presented on pages 6 and 7 of
21 the Proposed Plan.

22 For Units 1 and 4, excavation and disposal
23 of radium-contaminated shallow surficial soil was
24 recommended. No further action for PCB and
25 PAH-contaminated soil is recommended at these units

1 because excavation for the radium-contaminated soil
2 would also remove these contaminants. No further
3 action was recommended for Unit 2, and excavation was
4 recommended for Unit 3 to remove the remaining PCB
5 contamination from the soil. Finally, no further
6 action was recommended for Unit 5. Next please.

7 Previous investigation results for Unit 12
8 indicate that VOCs, SVOCs, PAHs, PCBs, pesticides,
9 herbicides, cyanide, petroleum hydrocarbons, and
10 naturally occurring metals were identified in soil
11 most frequently from zero to five feet below ground
12 surface.

13 Radium concentrations were consistent with
14 the naturally occurring background concentrations.
15 And soil contamination was localized and did not
16 extend or pose a threat to groundwater which also
17 occurs at approximately 100 feet below ground surface
18 at this site.

19 Based on previous investigation results and
20 on risk evaluation conducted by the Navy for Site 12,
21 no further action was recommended for Units 1, 2 and
22 4. And for Unit 3, excavation of contaminated soil
23 was recommended to prevent off-site migration of PCB
24 and PAH contamination.

25 Well, the Navy used these results and

1 recommendations to evaluate cleanup alternatives for
2 Sites 8 and 12 in the Feasibility Study. They
3 included no action, which by law is evaluated to
4 provide the basis from which to develop and evaluate
5 the other remedial alternatives. Alternative two that
6 was evaluated was capping plus institutional controls
7 and access restrictions. Alternative three,
8 excavation and off-site disposal of contaminated soil
9 is the Navy's proposed remedial action. Alternative
10 four was excavation with soil washing and thermal
11 destruction. Alternative five, excavation, soil
12 washing, and off-site disposal was also evaluated.
13 You should note that alternatives four and five are
14 not applicable for radium-contaminated soil. Next
15 please.

16 Each alternative then underwent a detailed
17 evaluation and analysis in the feasibility study using
18 nine criteria developed by the U.S. EPA. The nine
19 criteria are divided into three groups including:
20 threshold criteria, primary balancing criteria, and
21 modifying criteria. Instead of reading these to you
22 tonight, I'd like to refer you to page 12 of your
23 Proposed Plan where they are discussed. Next please.

24 The next three slides present a summary of
25 the comparative analysis of the remedial alternatives

1 with respect to these nine EPA criteria. This
2 evaluation is presented on page 13 of your Proposed
3 Plan.

4 According to this evaluation, alternative
5 three, excavation and off-site disposal of soil would
6 be protective of human health and the environment. It
7 would comply with ARARs. It would rank high with
8 respect to long-term effectiveness and permanence.
9 Next please.

10 It would rank high with respect to reduction
11 of toxicity, mobility or volume through treatment. It
12 ranks low with respect to short-term effectiveness and
13 ranks moderate with respect to implementability. Next
14 please.

15 Alternative three also ranks moderate with
16 respect to total cost, and it can be accepted by the
17 State of California. Community acceptance will be
18 evaluated following receipt of public comments.
19 Public comments will be addressed in a responsive
20 summary and documented in the ROD. Next please.

21 In summary, proposed alternative three,
22 excavation and off-site disposal of contaminated soil,
23 would provide for removal of radium-contaminated soil
24 from Site 8, removal of PCB and PAH-contaminated soil
25 from Sites 8 and 12, disposal of contaminated soil at

1 an appropriate off-site facility that meets federal
2 and state regulations and would also provide for
3 unrestricted reuse for Sites 8 and 12 after achieving
4 cleanup goals.

5 The BRAC team concurs with this Proposed
6 Plan for excavation and disposal of contaminated soil
7 from the impacted units at Sites 8 and 12, and no
8 further action for soil at the remaining units at
9 these sites.

10 This concludes the Proposed Plan summary
11 portion of this meeting. Thank you.

12 MR. DARREN NEWTON: Thank you, Jim.

13 Before we open for formal comments, are
14 there any clarifying questions on the proposed summary
15 that was just presented? For example, are there any
16 terms that were presented that need clarifying?

17 Please hold all other questions and comments
18 for the formal comment portion of this meeting. You
19 may make your comments tonight during the public
20 comment portion of this meeting. You may make
21 individual oral comments to the court reporter. You
22 may submit comments in writing and submit those
23 comments in the boxes located on the table behind me.
24 You also may use the comment forms provided, and
25 please submit them tonight.

1 You may also send written comments via mail
2 postmarked no later than April 26 to the address up
3 above. You may also fax your comments to myself, Mr.
4 Darren Newton at (949) 726-6586. All written comments
5 must be sent no later than April 26th, 2006.

6 Are there any clarifying questions on the
7 Proposed Plan summary as presented?

8 If there are no clarifying questions, I'll
9 open up the meeting to public comments. Please state
10 you'd like to make a comment, wait for the microphone.
11 State your name, your affiliation, and provide your
12 comment or question.

13 MR. LEON DELANEY: My name is Leon Delaney
14 (phonetic). My question is -- sorry. I'm sorry. I
15 came in a little late. In the '20s and '30s, one of
16 the largest kaolinite -- that's K-A-O-L-I-N-I-T-E --
17 clay mines were here at El Toro. The thing about
18 kaolinite is it's basically worthless soil. It's good
19 for ceramics, pottery. It's incompactable, and it
20 implodes on itself like a house of cards. And one of
21 the biggest mines was right here at El Toro.

22 So my question is it has to be removed down
23 to the bedrock about three or four or five feet. What
24 is the Navy planning on doing about removing this soil
25 before they put any weight on it like buildings,

1 homes, office buildings? That's my question.

2 MR. DARREN NEWTON: Thank you for your
3 comment.

4 Are there any other comments for this
5 Proposed Plan summary?

6 MS. MARCIA RUDOLPH: Marcia Rudolph,
7 M-a-r-c-i-a, R-u-d-o-l-p-h, RAB member. Years ago
8 sort of following the process, there was a site
9 designation of Site 25 which had to do with the washes
10 and the drainage off site. I'm assuming that the --
11 you know, this display over here shows part of that --
12 or what is part of that or was that not part of what
13 was Site 25?

14 Do we get an answer?

15 MR. DARREN NEWTON: We're taking public
16 comments. The Navy will not address your comments or
17 questions now. They will be responded to.

18 MS. MARCIA RUDOLPH: To put it in format,
19 the concern is that there may be some things that have
20 gotten off site that -- off base because of the flow
21 of various liquids over the years off the site. And
22 I'm aware that the Navy does not look into what goes
23 beyond the boundary unless it's a subsurface and
24 vadose zone.

25 I would like to know where the contaminated

1 soil is going to be taken to. I understand the
2 parameters of the site. I just would like at some
3 point to know exactly where that place is.

4 Also, there was some concern about the
5 old -- the old drainage from the old sewage treatment
6 plant and where that material went and if there was a
7 potential leakage in the old clay pipe system. I
8 would like to make sure that that issue is covered in
9 comments and will be looking forward to comments from
10 the regulators on this.

11 MR. DARREN NEWTON: Thank you for your
12 comment.

13 MR. PETER HERSH: Peter Hersh, member of the
14 El Toro RAB. A question I'd like an answer to is
15 alternatives four and five seem to be a more thorough
16 method of cleanup. I'm wondering why those alternates
17 were not pursued and not considered. The answer is
18 that everything here now contains -- or does contain
19 radium-contaminated soil. I don't understand -- I'm
20 not sure looking at this whether or not all the
21 removal areas do contain contaminated soil. Thank
22 you.

23 MR. DARREN NEWTON: Thank you for your
24 comment.

25 We have approximately 15 more minutes for

1 the public comment period. I would like to suggest we
2 go off the record if there is no further comments. If
3 there is additional comments, we can go back on the
4 record. We'll wait until the comments period is over.
5 We are off the record.

6 (Pause in the reported proceedings.)

7 MR. DARREN NEWTON: We'll go back on the
8 record. If there are no more public comments, this
9 concludes the public meeting for Installation
10 Restoration Sites 8 and 12 Proposed Plan for Former
11 Marine Corps Air Station El Toro.

12 Public comments can be made in writing.
13 They can be mailed to the Navy BRAC office. They can
14 be sent to this address up on the screen as well as on
15 page 15 of the proposed plan as well as individual
16 written comments can be placed in the box behind me.
17 All comments must be submitted no later than April
18 26th.

19 Thank you, all. This concludes the public
20 meeting for Installation Restoration Sites 8 and 12
21 Proposed Plan, and we are off the record.

22 (The meeting was adjourned at 7:34 p.m.)

23 ---oOo---

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

) ss

2 COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO)

3
4
5 I, the undersigned, a Certified Shorthand
6 Reporter of the State of California, certify that I am
7 a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of
8 California, License No. 9800; that the forgoing pages
9 are a true and correct transcript of a Public Hearing
10 for the Proposed Plan for Installation Restoration
11 Sites 8 and 12 for Former Marine Corps Air Station
12 El Toro.

13 I further certify that I am not interested
14 in the outcome of said matter nor connected with or
15 related to any of the parties of said matter.

16
17 Dated this 9th day of April, 2006.
18

19
20
21 

22 MACHELLE JAARSMA

23 CSR License No. 9800

24 ---oOo---



BROWN AND
CALDWELL

MULTI-MEDIA ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE CONTRACT TRANSMITTAL MEMORANDUM


Contract No. N-68711-00-D-0004

File Code: 126463-003/3.12

TO: Contracting Officer
Dept. of the Navy
Base Realignment and Closure
Program Management Office West
1455 Frazee Road, Suite 900
San Diego, CA 92108-4310

DATE: 5/8/06
D.O. # 0069
LOCATION: MCAS El Toro

Attention: Gracy Tinker

FROM: Bob Coleman 
Project Manager

DESCRIPTION: Former MCAS El Toro Public Meeting Transcript, 3/29/06, for the Proposed Plan
for Installation Restoration Sites 8 and 12, Irvine City Hall

TYPE: Deliverable (Cost) ☐ Deliverable (Technical) ☒ Other ☐

VERSION: N/A REVISION #: 0
(Scroll down - e.g., Draft, Draft Final, Final)

ADMIN RECORD (PM to Identify): Yes ☒ No ☐ Category ☐ Confidential ☐

DELIVERY DATE: 5/8/06

NUMBER OF COPIES SUBMITTED: 4C/4E

COPIES TO (include Name, Navy Mail Code, and No. of Copies):

SWDIV:

G. Tinker (O/0E)
D. Newton, BPMOW.DN (1C/1E)

D. Silva, 05G.DS (3C/3E)- 2 for
AR; 1 for IR

OTHER (Distribution done by BC):

M. Flesch, El Toro (1C/1E)

D. Parker, Bechtel (1C/1E)

Brown and Caldwell/CDM:

Bob Coleman, BC (1C/1E)
Matt Brookshire, CDM (1C/1E)
BC Project File, (1C/1E)

O = "Original" transmittal and letter

C = "Copy" of transmittal and letter

E = "Enclosure" one enclosure

Brown and Caldwell, 9665 Chesapeake Drive Suite 201, San Diego, California 92123